

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**November 20, 2001 Meeting**  
**Minutes**

**Attendees**

|                     |                                   |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clark, Jeffrey      | Weyerhaeuser                      |
| Craig, Scott        | USFWS                             |
| Cramer, Darin       | DNR                               |
| Dominquez, Larry    | DNR Small Forest Landowner Office |
| Glass, Domoni       |                                   |
| Hansen, Craig       | USFWS                             |
| Heide, Pete         | WFPA                              |
| Hersh, Mark         | EPA                               |
| Hunter, Mark        | WDFW                              |
| Jackson, Terry      | WDFR                              |
| Lippke, Bruce       | University of Washington          |
| MacCracken, Jim     | Longview Fibre                    |
| Martin, Doug        | CMER Co-Chair                     |
| McConnell, Steve    | NWIFC                             |
| McNaughton, Geoff   | Adaptive Management Administrator |
| Parks, Dave         | DNR                               |
| Pavel, Joseph       | NWIFC                             |
| Peterson, Pete      | UCUT                              |
| Pleus, Allen        | NWIFC                             |
| Pucci, Dawn         | Suquamish Tribe                   |
| Quinn, Tim          | WDFW, CMER Co-chair               |
| Raines, Mary        | NWIFC                             |
| Rowe, Blake         | Longview Fibre                    |
| Rowton, Heather     | WFPA                              |
| Schuett-Hames, Dave | NWIFC                             |
| Sturhan, Nancy      | DNR                               |

---

October minutes were approved as distributed (all comments received were incorporated).

---

**Setting and Approving CMER Agenda:** Martin noted the importance of listing action items in advance and sending appropriate background information so that people can make decisions at the meetings. At the end of each meeting, agenda items for the next meeting will be requested. Any agenda items added after that time should be sent to Tim Quinn or Doug Martin. You are encouraged to submit agenda items at least two weeks ahead of the meeting. Additional agenda items, brought on the day of the meeting, will be addressed at the end of the day if time permits. Hunter was concerned that because some SAGs meet within two weeks of a CMER meeting, this would create a problem with the two-week deadline. To address this concern, agenda items will be accepted after the two-week timeframe, but you are encouraged to submit them as soon thereafter as is possible, especially if they are action items.

---

**Stakeholder group update:** McNaughton said that the stakeholder group met two weeks ago. They talked about several ways for CMER and policy to interact. Early in the project, Policy needs to understand why each project is important and what the implications are. As the studies progress, policy will be kept informed of progress. Later on in the process, ramifications and results of studies will be presented to

policy and they will be well prepared to receive this information. Policy must also be engaged during major decision points in CMER projects (example is PIP).

The group also tried to come up with a template to provide continuity in how things are presented to Policy and to make it easier for SAGs to provide the most critical information. However, the information differs substantially from project to project so this is best done on an individual project basis.

Clark asked if there was discussion about how the stakeholder group would be part of an adaptive management process design. McNaughton said that people are still skeptical about this group and it may be used only in the interim until a more permanent process is designed. He also noted that no one person has the background to provide detailed information to policy on all projects. We need to ensure that the appropriate technical people are present to answer any questions.

Heide said that this process is informal. This group will provide advance warning of what is going on in CMER so that as we seek policy decisions, the policy will have a good idea of what is going on and will be able to make a decision.

---

Allen Pleus distributed a draft template for use in tracking ad hoc groups and it will be distributed to the larger group for use at a later date.

---

**CMER Workplan:** McNaughton sent a detailed outline to those who expressed interest in participating in this process, but he has only had one comment back thus far. Quinn proposed that McNaughton meet with the small group, get the Table of Contents finalized, and then bring it here for action. Sturhan suggested adding a training plan.

Committee members are Allen Pleus, Domoni Glass, Pete Heide, Joseph Pavel, Nancy Sturhan, and Helen Bresler. Please contact Geoff McNaughton if you are interested in participating in this group.

---

**CMER Workshop to present first year results and discuss upcoming projects:** Quinn said that, given what is dealt with in the regular CMER meeting schedule, there is not time to discuss the scientific relevance of projects. Since science is the main task of CMER, there may be a need to formalize a workshop process where the talk focuses on science. The emphasis would be on projects with results, but this workshop would also serve as an opportunity to talk about upcoming projects that will require funding. Thoughts and suggestions were requested. If CMER feels that this is a good idea, Geoff, Doug and Tim will draft a formal proposal.

Thoughts of the group follow:

- Suggested time frame ranged from quarterly to annually.
- A question was raised about presenting scientific results of studies done outside of CMER. Melding this type of work into CMER meetings was suggested, but the group does not feel that CMER meetings can cover this.
- The stakeholder group should also be asked to attend and an even broader audience could be considered.
- Dealing with ongoing projects and proposed projects in one meeting may cause confusion and be difficult to coordinate.
- Many CMER members do not feel that they know what is going on with different projects.
- Workshops like this could be used to talk about projects requiring large amounts of funding.
- Another thing that will help us to make progress is completing the workplan. After we have a unified plan, we can weigh studies against the plan.

Doug Martin constructed the following table comparing a workshop and an annual review focus.

| Workshop                    | Annual Review            |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Status of projects          | Formal presentation      |
| Two-way talk                | Just attend/no talking   |
| Informal                    | No proposal/just results |
| Discuss science of proposal | Implications presented   |
| Management implementations  | Open to All              |
| Change directions           |                          |
| CMER And Policy Only        |                          |

CMER agreed that this is a good idea. Martin and Quinn will draft a clearer focus based on today's discussion and will bring forward a proposal at a later time.

---

**Bull Trout Management Implications:** Jackson distributed a handout titled "Whether USFWS Forest and Fish bull trout funds should be used to continue funding of the development of the Bull Trout Presence/Absence Protocol". BTSAG is seeking policy guidance regarding whether bull trout funds should be used to fund an additional year of data gathering for the bull trout presence/absence protocol. This is one of the first projects undertaken by BTSAG and they have spent \$500,000 towards development of a presence protocol (primarily conducted through the Rocky Mountain Research Station). The data available from sampling in Idaho does not fit the Washington area well so another year of sampling is being suggested (at an additional \$500,000).

Background: Within rule, it states that if WDFW, USFWS, Tribes and Landowners agree that certain areas are unsuitable for bull trout, they can be taken off the overlay. Scientifically credible protocols are needed to validate these calls, as well as for further research and development of habitat suitability predictive models.

The BTSAG does not have a unified position on this and are seeking policy guidance. CMER members should ensure that their policy representatives are briefed on this issue and ensure that they have the right representatives present on December 6 to discuss this. A clear depiction of the options is needed for policy as well. CMER is in agreement that this should go forward to policy for a decision.

---

**Skill-building Retreat:** Rowton distributed a proposal for a TFW/FFR retreat that would review the original TFW process and provide a refresher course on meeting process and communication skills. Skill building, education on the consensus process, and TFW ground rules are all agenda suggestions. McNaughton was supportive of this type of workshop and suggested that costs be minimized. This could also serve as a place to role out the CMER workplan. It has been suggested that we use this forum to agree on the status of TFW versus FFR. Hansen asked if the environmental caucus would be invited and the consensus is that they should be invited. Heide said that he is very supportive of this and is hoping that this will help people to work more effectively in the consensus process. Raines added that at this point we are not sure of the cost and it may be minimal. There was concern about discussing the TFW/FFR issue in this forum. It may be better solved elsewhere.

Raines and Rowton will be actively working on a proposal for this retreat and a small group was established which includes Geoff McNaughton, Joseph Pavel, Mary Raines, Heather Rowton and Peter Heide. If you are interested in participating, please contact Rowton.

---

**FFR Project Approval:** McNaughton got approval from policy in early November on the list of CMER projects approved in September and got final approval from the FPB last week for these projects. We have a long list to move forward. If there is unspent money that we can use to fund projects that are below the line, we need to find that out now. No SAGs indicated that they had any funding left.

The Policy committee did provide direction with regard to wildlife projects. They asked that the stakeholder group inform them which wildlife projects are L-1 questions. McNaughton and Pavel are working on this.

Hansen mentioned that there is still unspent BTSAG money. They did talk about where to spend that money and they agreed to put most of that money toward the last fish/last habitat study. This proposal by USFWS has not yet had complete input and approval from the BTSAG group as a whole.

This results in approximately \$60-70K available after the statistical support to the watertyping project is funded (this project was approved by CMER but was inadvertently left off the budget sheet). Pleus asked if we have any firm funding availability at this time. The answer is no we do not.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER agrees that this is not a unilateral decision and approves the USFWS transferring \$223,000 into the last fish/last habitat model therefore freeing up some CMER possibly funds for other projects.

SAGs should look at their projects and make sure they are within budget and then come prepared to make recommendations about where any possible additional funding should go. Peterson reminded the group that the previously approved eastside nomograph project should be funded first with the additional money (the cost is \$50K).

---

**Status of AMOC:** Quinn said that CMER representatives have been meeting with this committee periodically. There is recognition by the policy group that they need a conduit to help them keep up to speed on CMER issues. The stakeholder group can do this or it can be done using AMOC. Heide added that representatives from policy would be more than happy to communicate with the CMER co-chairs in either a formal or informal setting.

---

**RMZ Resample Proposals:** Pucci said when we discussed the RMZ resample proposal in June, we decided that it would go back to policy for approval, but now it is in the SRC and wondered if it should have gone back to policy for review first. McNaughton said that the proposals are out for LWAG review and are being sent to the SRC. MacCracken thought it would go to policy after the SRC. The group recommended that it go to policy categorized, after the SRC completes their work and there is a final CMER recommendation. Quinn added that normally it would not be done this way, but this one is different.

---

**Possible use of \$100,000 for CMER website, final review, publishing:** McNaughton said that there has been almost no use of the project development money. Pleus asked if we could open up the flexibility on use of these funds. If so, we would all vote on these proposals. Quinn said that we should decide as a group how to spend this money and we can carry it over. He added that we need to determine whether to spend this before the biennium or not. By the next meeting, SAGs should bring forward their ideas about how to spend this money.

Hunter said that the temperature workshop study could use some of these funds. There were two workshops, proceedings were drafted, and the contracts associated with the workshop have been completed. The proceedings adequately capture the results of the workshops but are not formal. Formalizing them would require hiring an editor, which would cost around \$3,000. Quinn said that we do need to polish this since it changes the direction of our temperature work.

**CMER Consensus:** \$3,000.00 will be provided from the project development funds to edit this document. It will then be referred to as a Proceedings Report.

---

**SRC:** The first projects have been delivered to the SRC. TFW 118 has been distributed along with the RMZ resample proposal. More suggestions for reviewers are needed and their experience should be listed. Martin reminded the group that the general turn around time is 8 weeks for this.

---

**Projects for approval and time estimates for submission to the SRC:**

The following SAGs have no projects for review at this time: BTSAG, ISAG, WETSAG, LWAG, RSAG, and SAGE.

UPSAG anticipates having a request ready next month for SRC review of the groundwater recharge project. Schuett-Hames added that the Riparian effectiveness proposal should be ready for SRC review by early January.

---

**CMER Member Communication:** Martin said that there are people here who talk to the public about CMER. We need to decide whom they are representing when they go out and do that. His thought is that we cannot control what people say and do or what they are invited to. However, you should state that you are not representing the views of CMER officially (disclaimer). We will eventually need to state this in the workplan.

There was much discussion about how *outside* communications should take place. The general consensus was that individuals should clearly indicate that they are *not* representing CMER, and that people should be ethical and use common sense about what they discuss. Any results that may be presented should be clearly identified as interim if they are not final. Formal guidance on this issue will be provided in the workplan and the original TFW ground rules can be consulted for guidance as well.

WFCA is hosting a meeting and invited many folks to speak there. Raines concern is the way the WFCA session is structured. The participants are being referred to as CMER representatives and they will need to make it very clear that they are not representing CMER but are participating in CMER. Glass will call WFCA to ensure that the conference coordinator introduces the panelists as CMER participants, not CMER representatives and that he introduces the discussion correctly as well.

---

**RSAG Issues:**

Hardwood Conversion RFP This RFP was distributed for comment in September and UPSAG had concerns, which have been addressed. At this point, RSAG is asking CMER to approve the RFP for contracting. McConnell said that data collection was changed slightly to accommodate UPSAG and this did add a small cost to the collection effort. UPSAG will be conducting research further down the road than RSAG and they will initiate their own proposal with funding outlined at that time.

**CMER Consensus:** The Hardwood Conversion RFP is approved to move forward.

Riparian Growth and Yield Planning: Hunter said that there are several options to consider as we move forward with the growth and yield target studies. The UW is putting forward a riparian growth and yield co-op, which combines funding from many different organizations, and if this goes forward, some data may be collected by them. RSAG is tasked with examining ORGANON for credibility. They can either do this with a long term study which will be 15-20 years or can initiate a rough cut study and plan from there. They will be drafting these options to more clearly articulate them and will bring forward a proposal at a later date. They will also continue work on the literature review associated with this project that is already funded.

Type F&N Effectiveness Working Group Staff Needs: There is a partial study plan drafted but the workgroup is still discussing it. They would like to initiate a pilot study next summer, but will need

someone to work with landowners to find sites. The recommendation to CMER is that we fill the other CMER staff position at the NWIFC with a person to fill this role. They will need to develop site locations and relationships with landowners. Schuett-hames mentioned that this project will involve identification of a large number of study sites. It will be long term in nature and a large amount of work will be needed to identify harvest units coming up in the near to mid-term, gathering data on harvest schedules, screening sites, etc. There will also be a number of CMER projects that end up needing this type of assistance. Heide asked if this person would be able to help with the MDT projects as well. Martin said that it would be helpful to the MDT to have this person on board.

SAGs will communicate about their thoughts on the CMER Staff position and will come prepared to make recommendations at the next meeting.

---

**Small Landowner Issues:** Pucci asked, on behalf of the Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee (SFLAC), whether CMER is planning to look at the economic impacts of Forests and Fish on small forest landowners. They would like us to look at this when the L-1 issues have been taken care of. The SFLAC would also like to know how the get outside research included in CMER.

The outside research issue will be addressed in the work plan. Quinn said that as to the economic issues, they are not covered in L-1 and are therefore a policy issue.

Heide said that in FFR where it talks about adaptive management, it does talk about operational efficiency as well. As CMER looks at effectiveness monitoring, they should be cognizant of that language in the report. There is an element of economics in adaptive management. Pleus added that since the SFLAC is a subcommittee of the FPB, they can bring projects forward directly to the FPB for consideration and get outside research approved that way.

---

**PIP RFP:** Raines said that the RFP for the analysis of the 2001 data collection for the PIPs is almost ready and will be available soon. They are requesting that as soon as they have it available, people have a set amount of time for review and comment and then the project would move forward without coming back to another CMER meeting for approval. This will go out to the full CMER list.

CMER consensus: This document will go to the CMER committee for review, comments will be received and incorporated, a final draft will go out to CMER and the project will move forward.

---

Agenda items for December meeting:

Workshop proposal (Martin and Quinn)

Budget Update

SRC review

Set schedule for following year (please get your dates in if you won't be at the meeting)

Next meeting is 12/12 in room 537